

Notes from PCT Ad-Hoc 6/12/97

Q - (Bob Pine) - If we've made specific comments, that let's say there's agreement, should be addressed and that changes should be made, is there going to be a new version of this document then that incorporates those comments ?

A - The way we're headed and we're collecting comments from BDAC and public comments and also PCT comments and we will be producing another version of the alternatives, but it will probably be a narrowed set of alternatives but we want to get these comments into the mix so that as we produce that narrowed version we have all those comments reflected.

Q - So if we as an agency, bring up at this meeting a particular comment, is the purpose of doing that to figure out if we have a legitimate concern or is it to further amplify what the comment is all about so that then be incorporated into another document ?

A - Is both of those things - we need to make sure that we are clearly understanding your point so we don't address it incorrectly; we also want to discuss it among the agencies because we found in the past, its not all comments but some comments from agencies conflict directly with comments we've received from other agencies, so we need to all understand that if Bob brings a comment up and your agency feels completely different about that, then we need to discuss that and try to arrive at some common understanding, to the extent and those that we can't arrive at a common understanding, we will then identify the differences and

(Bob Pine) Yeah, because different agencies will obviously have different regulatory responsibilities, so there might not be agreement but this is something that is important or not important, but is something that people should understand

Any other questions about where we're going from here, what the intent is ?

The proposal on the table is we will take each agencies comments, in turn, and ask the agencies representative to identify what they think are the most crucial issues they choose to deal with and I will ask the Program Managers to identify those ones that they need additional clarification on, and we'll try and move through in that fashion.

(Frank W.) One comment I'm going to make from my perspective is, I would personally really get a lot of satisfaction out of getting real direct, honest responses back from the Program Managers from the standpoint that's the lamest idea I've ever heard, or that's not a concern because we dealt with this in this way

I'm glad that you said that because we were planning on being vague and dubious

I understand your point. We'll try to be as brutally honest as we can.

(Rick W) That's the first time anybody asked us to be honest.

(Steve Y) - We thought this was CALFED.

(Mark C) - That's not a solution principle.

Good Point.

O.K. since Frank was the first to get his comments in here we'll bring Fish & Games up first and ask him to identify what he thinks are the most crucial issues that we need responses on.

(Frank W) - We bullet seven key items that I'll pick one of them to kick things off. One of things we were asked to put in here by several people at our department was the third bullet relative to the screening options at Clifton Court that in a very general way the concern was that the alternatives described was ok we're going to do this, and we'll either screen the intake of Clifton Court or upgrade the existing screens and our approach of this is that those aren't just like options 1A or 1B, those are like big time, that's significant decision to make in terms of what you decide to do in regards to screening with any one of the alternatives that necessitate dealing with screens down in the South Delta

OK, that's good, that's a really important issue, and let me give just an overview, and then I'm going to ask Ron to speak to some of the specifics. We were purposely vague on that issue because we had a interagency team working on the screening issue, we asked them to make recommendations related to each of the alternatives, there work was not completed, we got a report last week, I guess it was, so I think our intention is to take that report, we will circulate it, once, it needs to be refined a little bit, we'll circulate it to all the agencies, you may already be aware what's in the report, but we'll make that available and we'll also craft a specific screen recommendation for each one of the alternatives, I think because it is such an important issue we will circulate it separately before we come out with a modified alternative, the disclaimer I want to put on this is, while the interagency team worked hard and tried to arrive at a consensus on these issues, I'm not certain we're at consensus, there's still some concerns on the part of some committee members about the way that things are characterized on the screening issues, I think we have sufficient information at this point where we move forward with the programmatic alternative but there's clearly a lot of details of the proposals that we're going to have to work through to try to resolve over the next year or so, but I guess kind of with that overview I'll ask Ron to if he could characterize some of the conclusions that screen team came up with, and so that you'll have a sense of what you can expect to see in the next round.

(Ron O) - One of the major consistencies that came to us that it is technologically feasible to screen at the other end of Clifton Court Forebay, that will certainly cut down on the perdition problem, and we actually got a schematic how they would do that using a sawtooth design, that's coming out in the pre-draft report. The reason why in the alternative like Steve mentioned was that the **screens at present or screens be moved forward** in terms of the feasibility of the impacts, you got to do it well, so we left it wide open to pre-narrow in other places, but if it say is

technological feasible it all going to be considering the grain, and the power fluctuation and all that, so there recommendation is that you ... you may have to screen at up to 300,00 cfs (tidal fluctuations) ... so the next stage after that they have to go out before they review pre-feasibility and get there calculations. Did you want to deal with the other ones also Steve, like Hood connection and so on ?

Let's just give them a general overview of what Hood connection is.

Hood, definitely deals with technological feasible that has several bays which they could actually isolate different components of it, so its like multiple intakes in some ways, our biggest issue there was the return flowback so you don't get the circulation, once we pick the fish up, how do we put them back into the tidal fluctuation, what won't bring them right back into it, screen issue on some of the alternative, do we screen it and do we actually put the water back in the central delta, like we do in several of the alternatives, the big issue there is how we would manage upstream migrants, mainly everything about incubation will be looked at, build rocks, build ladders, or ... We did get bogged down a little bit on what we call concentration, if we go and put a small isolated facility in, we concentrate the fish that we screen out in a lesser amount of water and then you draw them in the Central Delta anyway, so if you screen, say if you had 15,000 cfs in the river, you screen 5 and you leave 10, then you take the remainder, not the whole but close you basically concentrate the fish in what you take across Georgianna and Two Mile, and wether that is good or bad is subject to discussion. But in a nut shell, mostly what they really like to see is they thought they could get the best screening efficiency if they screen all 15,000 cfs, then operate at 15,00 cfs which we're always going to have as standby, in the pump there, and run that less frequently ... all alternatives, if your not aware, we have the ability, to leave the ability and pump 15,000 cfs at the south Delta pumps, no matter where we put the isolated facilities and they will screen that also. Well any general questions ?

(Frank W) - Even with an isolated facility you would leave 15,00 capability in south Delta, for these three, why would you do that ?

(Ron O) - In case you had to shut the other one down for system redundancy, say we had smelt blocking the front of it or some reason; its a question, that's the original recommendation, for all operations and feasibility studies is how much you could stand being shut down up there, right now all of our alternatives ...

(Steve Y) - Having said that, all the alternatives at this point may be prone to that, when we get through impact analysis, there may be some information there that would bear on that decision, certainly the cost data will bear on the decision, because two full, actually three different screening systems is going to be tremendously expensive, and then some judgements will have to made as to the amount of flexibility that provides and wether the flexibility is worth the costs involved, but that's where we're heading anyway, at least to display those things and allow those that are going to make the decision and those that are going to have to pay the bill to have some input.

(Penny H) - One other comments that we have on the screens is that, it wasn't phrased quite like this, is that engineers can basically do anything if you give us enough time and money, but right now the actual capability of some of the screening as proposed will probably need to have some additional research, before we feel comfortable with it being able to do what the alternative says it is going to be able to do and I think that needs to be explained a little bit more in detail, which one going to be right now, which one is going to need additional research, that going to be part of the bill.

That's a good point. We should have included that, that was our thinking but this sufficient is analysis for this very early programmatic look but that we will have to look at increasingly levels of detail and research and prototypes and all kinds of things before we get to a site specific alternative in which we independently stand up and say yes, this accomplishes the objectives we have for fisheries protection, but that's a good point. Is that sufficient discussion with the screening issue or if so Frank why don't I let you just go ahead and keep identifying the key issues that you want to talk about.

Our fourth bullet where we heard Mark's presentation and Stein's about the crafting of alternatives that bracket maybe sub-alternatives and options that you don't have to run everything single configuration in order to know, in order to do programmatic EIR or even make decisions, we definitely understand, that makes a lot of sense to us, an alternative advanced in here, the body of our letter, that we talk about general assurances, we're not sure that the runs that are being done on the analysis' be looked at on the alternatives with it at the specific alternative that we present here.

OK let's elaborate on that because that is one of the things that we wanted to get from you is more clarification on your proposed alternative configuration and exactly what that accomplishes that our other alternatives don't. So could you step us through your recommendation and while your doing so indicate where its different from our alternatives and exactly the kinds of benefits your trying to get at through those proposals.

On the second page, we go over the components and some of them aren't a lot different then what is being proposed in some of the other alternative 3's, that whatever. We selected a 10,000 cfs and we recognize that between 5 and 15, that's understandable, but its ...

That wasn't a negotiating positions was it ?

I'm not much of a negotiator, so I'd better tell you what we want as opposed to dragging. We understand the 5 to 15 range was given with post processing were given some information of how 10 maf might work, but linking that with things were he talked about which having an operating increase separate phase of stream facilities, ... the turnout, which is basically a couple of thousand cfs into the North Delta, is later on we have some operating criteria for that which would avoid with great extent concerns with upstream migrating of pike salmon, cause of timing that you would use it, and the reason for it is to try to provide a way to get central Delta flows for

agriculture primarily and exports from South Delta through a screened facility at Hood, you wouldn't have to duplicate that facility anywhere, but we would use that screened facility for the water that was going in the central Delta or Delta then move it toward the central and south Delta would be water that was screened and the timing of the closure of the Delta cross channel would obviously have a lot to do with the effectiveness of that eventually allow for it.

I'm glad that Bob returned. We're talking about Fish & Game's proposed alternative that has the 2 -3,000 cfs turnout of water into Mokelumne, really wanted to hear what the Service's view of that is, because Fish & Game's intention on this modification to our basic alternatives is to provide screened water, water that has been screened at Hood, into the north and central Delta, so that the agricultural diversion in the central Delta as well as any diversions then made at the south Delta pumping plants, water volumes have been passed through a screening facility which would keep more fish in the Sacramento - I think we would certainly before we move forward with any kind of proposal like that, have to do some hydrodynamic modeling and see whether a turnout of that magnitude would really accomplish that because you still have of course Georgianna Slough and other avenues for unscreened fish to move into the central and south Delta but assuming, let's talk about it conceptually, recognizing that we would have to do some analysis to see if it would accomplish that, and do you have a reaction Bob ?

Yeah, I mean obviously that type of screening would be on, targeted more on anadromous fish, than with resident Delta fish, since they spawn in the central Delta so you wouldn't be trying them out of the central Delta, and some of the screening isn't necessarily that effective on the various life stages anyway, for instance Delta Smelt larval and juvenile fish aren't effectively screened, and as you get bigger the effectiveness increases, but Delta Smelt are just really peculiar in the way that they react to water flows, I mean that they have a transition speed, where they, as soon as the flows reach that, they sort of have a, they stop swimming, for briefly, so any kind of flow that gets to that speed is just going to cause them to impend, and so even with adult fish you have a limited ability with screening. So I guess my response to Frank is what he just described would probably be effective for anadromous fish, but would be limited with its effectiveness for the fish like Delta Smelt that spawn and live in the central Delta.

(Steve Y) - Would there be any concerns about cues resulting from Sacramento water, river water being put into the Mokelumne at that location and possible effects on, for instance the runs in the Mokelumne River and others ?

(Bob P) - Are you talking about in terms of like Steelhead or again anadromous fish ?

Yeah.

(Bob P) - Yeah, because with Delta Smelt they go all over the place anyway, I don't know if you could predict if you would influence their migrating over towards the Mokelumne versus migrating into Cache Slough or Lindsay Slough, in that area.

How about the anagrams fish runs in the Mokelumne and Calaveras perhaps ?

I would imagine pretty good.

But you don't see that as a major concern that the Service would have ? I guess the discussion I'm trying to hold is do we have a consensus of the group that we ought to move forward looking at this concept, or is there enough concern that we ought to take some other course on it ?

(Bob P) - It seems to me that each one of these alternatives have various concerns hooked into them in terms of fish and wildlife and vegetation, so all of them are going to have to be refined to maximize beneficial effects, and minimize adverse effects, and Frank's proposal or Fish & Game's proposal will have beneficial effects just like these other ones and what we'll have to do is to see if we could come up with ways of minimizing any adverse effects it might have.

Are there any other agencies that have a view on Fish & Game's proposal ? Spring forward.

(Penny H) - I can't comment on the technical adequacy of their proposal as it relates to the biology, but the one thing that strikes me, I think we're going to need to grapple with is this perception that we got an accordion system here, where when we got started on this process we had how many alternatives, we narrowed it to three, and then we expanded it a couple of times now, and we keep the growth going we're not going to narrow it down to a point where we can get the whole stakeholder community and all of us involved in figuring what we need to have in this alternative to make it an acceptable alternative. I now from a NEPA standpoint and also from CEQA standpoint, you need all of this to go back to the purpose of why are you doing this and does what your proposing accomplish what you are trying to do so you have really good alternatives out on the table. And not so much getting down to little tweaks here and there, at this point, so those are just two thoughts that I have. I'm not sure its worth my time to add another alternative.

(Steve Y) - I guess my proposal if we decide this is a good concept to move forward with, maybe I should back up and say the way I view it is, their proposal is one of our alternatives key proposals, with just a small modification that is a turnout on the Mokelumne, the rest of it is essentially alternative, one of the alternative s. Is that correct ? Frank, am I missing any other important aspects of that ?

(Frank W) - I think the other significant point which on page four is a discontinued use of Clifton Court Forebay, except for in emergencies. The other aspect to ours that are different is having Clifton Court on standby, in an emergency basis, no screen at the intake of Clifton Court Forebay, upgrade the federal facility and only use it to pump from the Delta, from the south Delta, that's a component that's maybe ..

(Steve Y) - So you would use the operational tie between Tracy and Banks to move water into the California Aqueduct, then you would close the Clifton Court Forebay and move water

through that way ?

(Frank W) - Clifton Court, when I say its closed, I'm saying that its plumbed to the isolated facility so its closed looped, its a feature reservoir; distilling basin for the actual isolated facility, and you have a separate Delta-Mandata canal being fed directly out of the Delta where you would actually being exporting from the Delta, that interconnection is still there so that there could be opportunities to, the flexibility to get an emergency capacity ...

(Steve Y) - Would you propose to upgrade the Tracy screens then ?

Yes.

But not the Clifton Court screens ?

You would not, there may be some opportunity to, most of the focus in terms of dollars and technology would cover the Tracy facility; to improve the screens and fish handling and you wouldn't spend any more money on the facilities at Clifton Court other than to keep them so that they are operational, so you can use that capability in an emergency. No new intake, use exciting intake ...

That's your fifth bullet there under the recommended alternative, that says you would have a screened facility on Italian Slough, no new intake for the SWP.

I guess that's a alternative to a situation where you have a lot of San Joaquin Salmon showing up in the south Delta and they're right at the facility, the federal facility, the flexibility you could have would be to pump out of Italian Slough from Clifton Court, but that would be directly from Italian Slough down the channel to the pumps as opposed to going back to Clifton Court.

Being though, that I kind of view the turnout and that as being an ornament hanging on the main alternative and it wouldn't really drive a new alternative or mix but you would add these ornaments on a couple of the alternatives so that we get the analysis and see how they work, what the impacts are and the benefits and they can be displayed and those add-ons will turn out to be the best way to go they can certainly be tacked onto to the proffered alternative and move forward that way, so I don't see it as a major change in the way we're formulating the alternative.

(Bob P) - Frank, did you have a general philosophy of what you were trying to protect, you know with this alternative ?

Two philosophies we have, one of them is, first and foremost is how do we use this storage and conveyance as a ecosystem restoration tool. We believe that the one of the greatest tools we have in our arsenal is what we do with the storage and conveyance, new storage and how its operated and how you move water around and that it complements the ecosystem restoration program plan tremendously, so that's our main focus, Bob, saying ok what do we do to make things as best as

we can get them in the Delta, eliminating **cook-to-cook** and all the predation and without the cost of having the huge screening, being a concern

OK so you're looking at the entire suite of fish there ?

Right, and the ability to switch between the State and the Federal facility for a small volume of water 2 or 3,000 is similar to what is in one alternative where you take a look at what you actually observe where the fish are, where they are concentrated and give you some flexibility in terms of which valve do you turn, in order to avoid really smacking the fish, we expect if this alternative we're to move forward we'll have a lot more Delta Smelts spawning and rearing in the South Delta. There may be opportunities to pull through Italian Slough and not have a tremendous influence on the South Delta were you would pulling through Old River and Grant Line Canal if you continue to use the Federal facility, so that the philosophy, if we're going to build a bunch of habitat, lets make it as protected and as useful as we can.

(Penny H) - So would you use the State pumps ?

That was the idea with the Italian Slough was you could use the State pumps ...

(Steve Y) - Both the isolated facilities would be tied to the State pumps, an isolated from Clifton Court and you would have the ability to take out of Italian Slough also

(Bob P) - And would there be flows that would give the behavioral cues or the movement of like the Delta Smelt, lets say, you put in South Delta habitat, to get them there eventually ?

(Frank W) - Only what's in the ERPP in terms of flow down the San Joaquin or something, that's the philosophy, the main philosophy, the other philosophy was some things we included in here which we're hoping makes something that's very controversially, meaning more powerful to the agricultural community in the Delta

Is it 6.1 regarding, really its modifications - South Delta improvements,

(Frank W) - That's the only opportunity I see is to move forward; we hope to have the type of deal where we have lets do this alternative plus all South Delta improvements, we basically have a modified package of improvements that its a lot different than what's in the current South Delta program, in terms of barriers, barrier operation, so that's it, I won't keep talking, those are the highlights about this alternative that, in a way we think, at least from our viewpoint may not be captured in the range of alternatives that are being evaluated now, we're willing to be convinced that that's not true, the range will capture that, that's not a problem, its just that its perfect for advancing this; it didn't seem readily apparent to us that, this combination would seem to have some special cidity that would necessarily come out of an alternative evaluation process.\

(Steve Y) - Mark, do you have any views on that ?

(Mark C) - The only thing that I would not buy then, of course is the release on the Mokelumne, we can do that, other than that its not going to be different from a modeling perspective of this alternative, other than split the middle of the 10,000 for the secondary diversion, something that we can hang on one of the alternatives, sort of as a secondary evaluation.

Nobody wouldn't have a chance to do this type of modeling in this particular phase, I assume we get into more detailed modeling, you could do hydrodynamic modeling using Italian Slough intake and Tracy and do particle tracking and figure out what really accomplishes this kind of thing. I was going to ask Terry if he had any input, I guess he's step out for a minute.

(Mark C) - I'm curious what kind of schedule you have in mind for making releases into the Mokelumne ?

(Frank W) - Right now its during the irrigation season, agricultural irrigation season.

(Steve Y) - Wouldn't you want to time it with the agricultural diversions and the South Delta pumping rates so that we would have some kind of boundary ?

(Frank W) - Absolutely, we have a spreadsheet that, where we tried to do that, that we could illustrate how those things would be operated, and there would be times, like the best opportunity would be like in the early spring, where we would say like, you have the Delta cross-channel closed, except for Georgianna and a little bit in pre-mounty , you actually are pulling screened water, and then in the summertime with recreational uses and other water quality issues in the North Delta, you probably will questionably...

(Steve Y) - Of course we could claim a lot of recreation benefits from turning Clifton Court into a windsurfing area, instead of a Bass fishing facility. Terry, do you have any views on Fish & Game's proposal and ...?

(Terry M) - On of the concerns is obviously the mis-direction of adult salmon when they return, and bringing water down the Mokelumne, could be a concern there, of if you look at the history of the Mokelumne River fish, they're scattered throughout the basin. So if you think of timing of when water is turned down the Mokelumne, could be a concern.

(Steve Y) - If we were putting water down the Mokelumne during the Delta irrigation season, and mainly during the summer diversion periods out of the South Delta pumps ?

(Terry M) - Well probably after mid-September it wouldn't be a problem.

(Steve Y) - You say probably

(Terry M) - Probably after mid-September

(Steve) Oh, after mid-September, I suppose irrigation season slacks off about September first

(Terry) - Releases during would probably be ok

I'm sorry I mis-understood, releases during the summer are ok, after mid-September it would matter. Well am I at least hearing support from the group to go ahead and add some of these features on to a couple of our alternatives so that they would be analyzed during impact analysis and modeling efforts and so forth ?

Alright, we'll go ahead and do that then. Is there other real important points, Frank, that you wanted to make out of your set of comments ?

I don't think so. I feel kind of bad, maybe some other folks should get some of there stuff out, cause I think some of these may be less important than some other issues that other agencies have brought up.

(Steve) - OK, Bob, I want to use some of your comments as a launch point to talk about a few issues that are common in the comments in a lot of agencies.

The ones I wanted to highlight were off of page 1 and page 3, I guess it was. It is in bullet #1, in which they comment, "we find it difficult at times to tell what the common programs really are, what they are composed of, this is particular true of the levee system integrity program". Our general response, and this was noted in many of your comments, we know that the levee program was deficient in its description for reasons that we talked about many times in the past, we won't get into that, but we want you to know that Victor and his staff are working on trying to get that flushed out and we'll be giving you copies of a hopefully clear and flushed out program, that you can review. Were there other common programs besides the levee program that was a difficulty for you ?

(Carolyn) - Well we felt there were a couple, we had problems with the water quality, I don't know if there is an amplified document of the water quality common program in addition to what we saw in the appendix. We were beginning to identify areas where we thought there should be an opportunity in which we should be able to provide input, I don't know where you are in regards to common programs.

(Rick w) - Well, Carolyn, in the effected environment, we're of course putting all the information on the problems areas ..., and I take it from that comment that another, that's pretty much the question is where is the substance, is that ...

Well, it also has to do with actions, some ... , I mean so its not just the impacts, there would actually be

Well like as I say, those other portions of the EIR made quite a lot of the issue, but I'm not sure

that I need to see a copy ...

Maybe that's an issue that you and Carolyn can ...

Unlike the levee situation, we know that just didn't get to a point you're past that point ...

But at the same time, irrespective of where its going to be decided all this stuff should be put, that we definitely do want to put some data into context, so I'm looking forward to the opportunity to recall almost everything we've got

I think in that regard do we have a rough schedule for the first round draft of impact analysis, and when they would be displayed to the PCT ?

There is a schedule, I don't know, I can't tell you of the top of my head, but it was suppose to be ...

(Ray M) - It was suppose to be the July PCT meeting. The next iteration from the team is suppose to be the end of next month.

(Steve) - Were there other concerns of the similar about other programs that needed more flushing out ?

(Bob P) - We had a thinking that the common programs, that they're meant to be beneficial, the net result is to be beneficial, so that when you then have the alternative, you then have a higher baseline because you put in these benefits, but when we look at their effects on different species and different habitats, we can't really make an easy judgement or decision or determination that these are beneficial, in some cases that some of these common programs might actually be adverse to species and to certain habitats, so it would help us in our analysis if we could see some type of matrix that sort of gave where the thinking is that there would be benefits, and so that we could then, to our thinking, look and see where there might be actually adverse effects.

(Penny H) - Doesn't that come out in the analysis part of it ? I guess, maybe you could tell me if this is the right way to approach this, not the most helpful way to do it, but we looked at the alternatives in the package that was sent out as purely that description, what's in the no-action, what's in the existing condition, what's in the alternative 1, 2, 3, what the elements of the common program and not at this point in time to look at some analysis to go by, make judgements on that, but just are these alternatives clear enough, comprehensive enough to warrant being alternatives that are legitimate to accomplish what we laid out, wether its beneficial or adverse, that will come after analysis and there might be some _____, not a kind of irritable approach to this, but do we have the components need to be in the alternatives at this point in time. That was kind of the ...

(Steve Y) - I think that will be displayed in the impact analysis, such as in July

(Bob P) - But I guess what I was getting at, if you can't from the description of the common programs make a decision in terms of the net effect of those programs, and then you look at the alternatives and try to compare them to each other with the idea that your going to have beneficial effects from the common programs that will sort of change the effect of the alternatives, then it makes for a difficult analysis, because you have from our standpoint have mixed effects of the common programs, some adverse, some beneficial and that has to then be applied to the alternatives in comparing them with each other.

(Penny H) - If alternative, my view is alternative 1 is all of the common programs, plus the storage and conveyance laid out in alternative 1A, B, C; alternative 2 is all of the common programs plus the storage and conveyance stuff laid out for the different steps; alternative 3 is all of the common programs plus the different storage and conveyance, is that accurate ?

That's good.

(Bob P) - Except, don't the common programs, to a certain extent vary depending on the alternative ?

(Steve) - There are slight variations, but when we got into it, we found the variations were much smaller than we would have thought, or at least that we weren't able to judge what those variations needed to be, just from the professional judgement standpoint, we deferred that until we had the impact analysis done, so we had a bigger understanding, as you described earlier some of the negative impacts, for instance the water quality program on the ecosystem program and vice versa, the way that the process typically goes is that do the impact analysis, propose mitigation for the adverse impacts, however in a multi-objective, multi-resource planning program, it becomes a process again of defining the mitigation, but then looking at the way the mitigation gets incorporated, the way it impacts other programs and you have to try and do an integrate approach to try and balance those things back again ...

Would that be part of your project description ?

Yeah, we will find that the mitigation proposed will then add to the description of the common programs as you define it, but there will be some judgements that ought to be made about mitigation actions that again may have impacts in other areas, in what we do with that. It become more that the matrix of impacts that's laid out ...

(Bob P) - OK, so maybe if we could just clearly state, maybe in the introduction or the common program section, that the effects of the various alternatives should be compared with the common programs, added on and that there won't be that much effect of varying the common program with each alternative. My understanding before had been that the common programs would vary to a certain extent with the alternative and there might be a variation of effects, but if that's not going to be significant then we could not include that with our analysis.

I do think it would be useful to state with the alternatives what tweak in the common programs might or are they considering for ...

Well, if describe in the general description the types of things in the alternatives, but that's a good suggestion. I wanted to jump to the next to last bullet that Fish & Game had, where it says there's a disturbing statement in the general description of Alternatives 2 & 3,

(Steve S) - If we could go back to the common programs for just a minute, that just to broaden this discussion just a little bit in terms of trade-off of impacts to the environment, that in our view a lot of the impacts to agriculture occur in the common program, and that the analysis is laid out at this point its conducted in the terms of an economic analysis rather than a resource based analysis, and I think its important to make that distinction and important to have an analysis of the impact to the natural resource base as it pertains to agriculture.

OK, when you say an analysis, are you talking about ...

In terms that agriculture provides habitat, ...

What I was getting towards was, are you talking about something that would be more than the impact analysis that we do, that would show impacts to agriculture because of the common programs and the storage & conveyance parts of it ?

As I've seen the outline, the impacts are addressed as economic impacts, and not as resource impacts, loss of prime AG land, for example, things like that

Correct me if I'm wrong, Ray, but we do have an analysis on prime AG land in the ...

(Ray) - Yeah, there has to be

In the economic section.

Well, in a couple of areas, one for is you have to have an area that addresses primarily farm land, period, you have to have a section that deals with that, we also deal with it in context as you eluded to, of economics, but you also have to look at in terms of potential habitat benefits and trade-off, for example, for waterfowl, so there will be some of that analysis, there is some discussion on farm land, agricultural habitats that exists, trade-offs and so if what you're getting at, are we in the ERPP program addressing the issue of prime AG lands lost the answer is no. But we do certainly have to, I probably should address this, some discussion of the benefits for enhancement of agricultural lands for agricultural habitats. Did I just confuse you more ?

Yes.

Mission accomplished.

There is a schedule, there has to be a schedule in the IS/R to deal with primary soils, impacts on agricultural economics, and

But not in terms of alternative configurations of the common program.

Not really, no.

Right now the problem I see is we're identifying physical changes in the environment in which have significant impacts and in CEQA you have to look at alternatives, you have to look at ..., and by excluding the common programs from that analysis, I can't understand ...

(Ray) - Well I don't, we're not excluding the, I think there is a distinct difference here, one is in the screening process that we went through, to put together the common programs, I haven't been involved in each one of those, so I think I shouldn't address them, we don't necessarily take into consideration every issue, if we did we wouldn't have a common program, probably, but if your thinking is that we are not evaluating the impacts of the common program, that's wrong, we will be evaluating across all the resource issue area, whether its prime land, soils, AG economics, etc., we will be addressing it.

But as there is an alternative analysis of storage & conveyance facilities, there is not a similar analysis of to the common programs.

(Ray) - I think that's correct, I think that the folks that put the common programs together had tried to put together these programs with trade-offs in mind, but there are clearly some goals and objectives, a purpose indeed for this program that they've tried to follow, so

The feeling we're getting from agriculture is there are significant redirected impacts to agriculture embodied in the common program, and so that really an alternative analysis that there is a flaw in the process.

Well, Pat, the common programs have to be analyzed.

But just as there are seventeen alternatives to storage & conveyance facilities, there are not alternatives ...

To the common program

Which is fundamental to CEQA compliance is the alternative, a reasonable range of alternatives, avoid or mitigate impacts, met or ...

I would take exception to that because my understanding is the way the alternatives are really being articulated is that each of the three alternatives share common elements, it is not a stand alone item, it is really shared among the three program alternatives, so is impact is being

compared in the body of each alternative, as amongst the other two, and you're, by trying to say each of the alternatives to the common programs are treating it as a stand alone item.

Alternative 1A puts the whole ...

The action ...

That's right, and to the extent that common elements are common among the three alternatives they are in fact being compared as amongst the other two or with the other two program alternatives being looked at in an entirety

It would certainly being a precedent setting for ...

I'm curious as to what the agricultural community to be a significant redirect of the impacts associated with the common programs.

The other things I see this describing, I mean you look at the impact, you adjust the pieces of the alternatives, you integrate communication issues, so in a sense that process is one of looking at adjusting the sort of alternatives to your initial approach to your objectives in your common programs, doing in such a way that you've mitigated issues, come up with a solution that ...

Let's move on.

I do think that is a point that we want to think on a little bit, is to make sure, that we're all focused.

I want to say the way I was looking at water use efficiency, because its part of the water management package, and essentially part of the cost for achieving water management effectiveness, there is potential to see that as varying significantly in terms of the level of implementation, the objective tools you use for judging water use efficiency, in each of the alternatives, I don't think that's been brought out enough the discussion engaged, for instance, under some circumstances, of demand management its more effective than some instances could be available with regards to water

(Greg Y) - Can I ask for clarification, I'm sitting in for Rick Soehren on this, representing water use efficiency, definition of demand management is that inclusive of, or given to land fallowing ? As a separate part of water use efficiency as discussed so far.

You asking would land fallowing be one of the tools which you could achieve water use efficiency ?

Yes.

(Greg Y) - That has been separated out of the water use efficiency.

Replaced in limbo under water quality.

(Greg Y) - Placed some in water quality, placed some in the ERPP, placed in ...

Are you talking about fallowing or retirement or conversion or ...

Its all the same thing

No

Yeah, because ...

Because to me, fallowing is sort of potentially the appearance, the temporary non-use of land, and not conversion as our group sees it.

(Greg Y) - If you use fallowing as a general term, because it makes it easier to talk about to talk about temporary fallowing or permanent fallowing; permanent fallowing becomes land retirement.

The impacts though are different, because with the permanent quote un-quote parcels that's got a different impact than the rotational that we generally refer to a fallowing.

Yes.

Well being too, but with respect to land retiring and land fallowing, that was written-off as I understand it.

(Greg Y) - Well its part of the water acquisition part of the ERPP, I mean there's 400,000 acre feet of water or 3-500,00- in the ERPP, that is an acquisition and one the ways requiring it would be through fallowing or retirement.

Which gets to my next point, is has to do with, getting at more clearly, what tools you have in hand to accomplish the environmental water objectives that you seek in the ERPP, the emphasis appears to be on the new storage and what we'll get from that, and so I find at this point rather vague of what we'll get through transfers, so to speak.

That should probably directed at Terry. That's a good question.

(Terry) - Well it is vague.

I think what I was saying was, not to blame it on the ERPP, but the program as a whole, I think

there needs to be a more stronger discussion on the different ways in which the program could more advance the protection acquisitions, wether involving the community or the ERPP objectives

Considering there's a lot of acquisition from a new facility, water transfers, water is a lot of the factors in the idea that the additional may be included in the restoration program, Sites Reservoir anyway, we realize the water quality there might be poor for anagrams fish, but that gives an opportunity for to go into water, for drinking water for other areas, locations in ... It still hasn't been described for really enough in the component correctly, we're at the point now where we need to integrate and move forward and clarify what we're going to do

For instance, when you look at Alternative 1A, we need a hard look at what could be done in that situation to get the water that would be needed. Its more each of the alternatives somehow has to be a really viable alternative or truly accomplishes the purpose in the end. And right now there isn't the definition and the detail in exactly where we're going to get how much, in the different alternatives, to make each one of them really viable. I think you don't have an easy task, and maybe we could talk about it and what you just said just isn't down on paper for everybody to understand and until its down on paper you can't really do the analysis that needs to be done, so that was just kind of general but very significant comment that I think once you get down on paper everybody will understand a little bit better, and the gaps in the alternatives, and what makes them not really truly an alternative, and how you can throw that in with something else it will all come together a little bit more.

(Rick W) - Carolyn, what can realistically be done to tighten up the end of it ?

(Mark C) - Let me just offer this first of all. This is a developing process, we've gone through a lot of trouble in the last couple of months to try to change our system modeling approach so that we can get a handle of quantities of water we're talking about to fulfill the ERPP goals, now its not happening as quickly as we would like it to, but we are carrying forward, and in the next couple of months we hope that our system modeling will give us a much better idea of just what quantities of water we're talking about, what locations, demand, those sort of things, so we can take a more direct approach to evaluating the source supplies essentially exist. Until we get our hands on how much water we're talking about its difficult to assess wether or not the supplies actually are available

I think its just in order to do that you got to know what is really being thought of, in each of the alternatives, what the grand scheme is, in some of these may even fall out, if not being at all viable, and we won't know that until we see what people are thinking.

(Bob P) - But on a programmatic level, would you even be getting into the details of that would allow that kind of analysis to be done. I mean in a way that you the ERPP is word of magnitude, greater detail than other sections of this alternatives analysis, really to balance these things you ought to take out some of the detail of the ERPP, its makes it more programmatic.

(Terry) - No.

I'm not saying the entire thing, I'm just saying when you look at the rest of the document, you look at the ERPP, there's an imbalance; and you should really do one thing or the other, you should make other part more detailed or take out some of the details, some of the numbers from the ERPP, say that this is the goal and what magnitude of water will accomplish that goal, will, we're just not going to state at this time.

Given the full range of alternatives, the alternatives have to be presented in an equivalent level of detail and my understanding was the ERPP was presented in more detail because the intent was to move ahead and forward and decisions were made in the Phase II where some components are therefore have separate and independent utility, and so you would be better off to make CEQA/NEPA determinations, any problems you mitigate at that level, before you make a program decision in Phase II for those things that fall in the goals of the ERPP, so that's why you're more detail now.

(Bob P) - Right, but you know what can honor this, or effects analysis is you can determine effects on different species with the ERPP, but you can't do that with the other common programs and the alternatives and so you're left with making the ERPP look like it has unusually greater effect.

But when you implement project specific elements in Phase III those are going to brought up to an equivalent level of detail before you make a decision to move ahead with those, with what is in the ERPP, we will probably have to apply the same process in the ERPP as well.

If I understand correctly your interested in implementing elements of the ecosystem restoration plan early, that's the way its been represented to me, because I work as a regulator I'm only interested making sure there's adequate documentation before we're constrained to make a current decision. I'm just partying the way its been explained to me.

Essentially you're talking about Category III funding.

Right. Exactly.

(Carolyn) - I would like to clarify something else, regarding these 17 alternatives, it appears there a couple which only focus on the type of isolated facility. If that is the case is that a program level distinction or are these candidates for collapsing into a more generic.

To the extent that the costs are much different, and the impacts are different, I would say that they are different variations in terms of water supply benefits, of course, there is basically no differentiation at all; so in terms of the level of effort it takes to evaluate the difference in those two variations, its not that the big of a deal, so wether you call it two or call it variations its just semantics as far as I'm concerned.

It seems to me, its nice to have some information that's maybe relative, plus you could always have that as a sidebar discussion, for the purpose of the flows, as you say the water supply area, there really is no decision, to my mind to make it easier.

(Ron O) - I really understand that, and I think in the second phase of narrowing, that's to be evaluated, that's where we're really concentrating our time, say rather than cover two or three of them.

I mentioned some of the concerns we have about the ERPP, and also feel that, and I'm not sure how to suggest it at this point, there are a couple of, there needs to be a lot more discussion about the transfers, particular to obtain the volume of water.

(Rick W) - Can you elaborate a little bit, Carolyn, you say there needs to be more discussion, but more specifically what ...

I thought maybe we could anticipate maybe the timing of the work on transfers to be such that we could actually put some, clear stating that the CALFED objectives of transfers and their importance to the program, there is various water uses included for the environment, actually maybe suggest the clearest thing, and what we needed from that, is what we really need to have tools to accomplish both in terms of policy, and a policy that works

Definitely, the group is not done with this either, I would kind of a heads up, this information, that we think should be part of the Delta, as we're looking forward ...

If I could add a little something to that too, I think the potential for conjunctive use, groundwater, surface water, for environmental uses needs to be categorized, apart from that on that concept its feasible and has advantages for environmental purposes as far as we can tell

(Q.) We have more specific comments on water quality, actions relating to salinity in the South Delta, there was a separate entry that talked about a measure that would result in dilution and rerouting and exporting. And structural options--such as the barriers--shouldn't really be part of the water quality program; rather, they are part of the south delta improvements and should be treated as such. Is there something about the south delta that makes it different from the other agricultural areas? Why has it been targeted?

(A.) The barriers are not actually part of the common program. They just happen to be in many of the alternatives.

(Q.) The water use efficiency material is much improved. There are some general assurances which are promising--such as performance expectations as a precondition to receive benefits from the Program. The Program should amplify how that will be implemented. At this point, it seems not so much a task for the Water Use Efficiency Group, but rather for the Program to demonstrate how these assurances could play out.

(Greg) We're in the process of doing that. As a sidebar the Agricultural Council will have its first meeting on July 16, where we hope they will be able to fulfill their endorsement plans and process as outlined under the Ag MOU. It's a little difficult to jump too far ahead of where that's going. We're relying upon that process as well as discussions with the stakeholder groups and the urban certification process.

(Rick W.) Regarding land retirement. We should avoid the use of the term "land retirement." We should first look at corrections that could be taken with landowners. For instance, we could try changing cropping patterns, then if that doesn't work, we could move on to temporary land fallowing; land retirement would be a last resort. Such a policy doesn't seem inconsistent with our water quality objectives. It's not necessarily imperative that retirement has to happen to achieve water quality. We need to do this to be better accepted by the agricultural community.

(Q.) Did you just say that for selenium reduction land retirement would be number one method for reduction, and that for salinity we would try this other suite of options?

(Rick. W.) Dan Nelson sez: For selenium, try these other options before retirement.

(Q.) Philosophically, I would agree with using this staged suite of options, but I would caution to set some timebars on how long these other measures have to work before moving on to the next measure. With the timebands, we can sell it to the environmental organizations as well as the aggies.

(Q.) I think that's an assurances issue.

(Q.) But we're not going to be able to bump it over to the Assurances Work Group. People have different opinions about what the Assurances Work Group should be doing which is different from what the Assurances Work Group thinks it should be doing.

(Rick. W.) No problem with that. Clearly, we'll want to see progress. Sounds fine.

(Q.) Add to that that the Service has been studying selenium since Kesterson and has studied these other measures in detail and has concluded that they don't work and that land retirement is the only thing that is feasible.

(Q.) They don't work because they haven't been implemented. It's a question of motivating the districts to implement them. Regulatory hammers don't work; we're engaged in this process now to demonstrate that. We need to give them the right kinds of signals and incentives, using a grass roots process. For instance, five years ago, the aggies didn't even know about water conservation, and now they are implementing conservation aggressively.

(Q.) CVPIA may be instructive here. They just received their first submittal of applications for retirement. There were dozens of willing sellers, and there's dozens of willing buyers eager to

convert the land to habitat, corridors, etc. Land retirement is a good tool, but it doesn't necessarily have to be spelled out in CALFED; the CVPIA is doing it. Land retirement can be part of a bigger picture.

(Q.) The point of my comment was to suggest that the Service has taken a stance on land retirement as the only feasible measure, and that maybe this stance doesn't integrate with CALFED's stance.

(Q.) I want to caution against relying too heavily upon the Rainbow requirements, which came out in 1990. The hydrology is very different down there now. You need to check with the Sites Resource Conservation District; look at their onfarm solutions to selenium.

(Rick W.) Retirement for salinity control is a real problem for us.

(Rick W.) Outbreaks in Milwaukee and Las Vegas, where treatment where as modern as they come.

(Carolyn): In terms of water quality, we had discussed prioritizing issues and focusing. Is there any headway on that?

(Rick W.) The Service was contacted to provide info, but they don't feel they can help out much because it's so subjective an issue. We're trying to prioritize through the assistance of stakeholders, but it's a very problematic process; there are many unknowns. Clearly, there are some cuts you can make. For instance, there is general consensus that mine discharges are of major importance. But agreement quickly devolves once you move down from the top of the list. Will require work on for a long time. We're aiming to define early implementation concerns.

(Q.) Concern about the No Action. It's extremely critical since all the other alternatives are compared to it, but I don't yet have a clear picture of what the No Action is. We need a better picture. For instance, what we're seeing in the modeling assumptions and what we see in the model are different. An example is Trinity: the flows we're seeing in model is 340, but the modeling assumptions assume much higher flows. It may be an inadvertant mistake, but it demonstrates how we don't have a clear picture. The public will need that as well.

(A.) There is a Trinity study (fish enhancement) underway that projects a flow of 340.

(Q.) My main point here is that there is a difference between the document and what's used in the model.

(A.) For clarification, we will be using the 340, and doing separate sensitivity analyses for the Trinity.

(A.) There may be differences between what we portray as no-actions and simplifications you

have to make when modeling.

(Q.) Then we need to understand those differences so that we're comfortable with the No Actions and for the comparisons to the No Actions.

(Q.) The Program needs a real clear statement of what the various CALFED agencies' roles are, how they conduct their business. It needs to be documented. No statement of what agencies are going to be doing. What will their responsibilities be in moving forward in the Program?

(Q.) Especially in terms of water quality, make sure we're using the expertise of IEP, that they are taking more of a role in assessing data.

(Rick W.) One of the things I'm supposed to do is get the grass roots interested and involved, such as watershed groups with citizen helpers, as well as other groups.

(Q.) The IEP is not a body to implement a project, but rather the keepers of the data. Anybody should have access to that data.

(Rick W.) There will be very specific requirements for analytic evaluation of data. IEP's product would be evaluative in nature.

(Q.) In terms of water quality, we need a description of the State Board's process. We don't see a lot of discussion about how these standards might change. How might we tweak the alternatives in relation to what is happening in the Board's process. We need to see some reflection of that.

(Rick W.) How would you go about it? It seems unlikely that the standards will be the same owing to differences in system configuration. So how would we anticipate what the changes might be? What are your suggestions?

(Q.) Just put in a description of what's going on in the Board's process, with some description of "if this, then that would change."

(Rick W.) The description seems like a good idea. Ron, how would this work?

(Ron) The first pass will stay to the recent standards, in order to produce a detailed evaluation.

(Q.) As an example, if X2 will continue as laid out, yet there is a different system configuration, what will it take to match them?

(Q.) Page 3, #12 of the document. Treatment or Removal. Some things listed are not pragmatic.

(Q.) Mine drainage stuff. We want significant discussion with Program because of litigation

going on.

(Rick W.) We're looking at other sites other than Iron Mountain.

(Q.) Under levees -- leaving in-channel islands to natural forces. There's an in-channel island subworkgroup, looking to get these islands anchored and with habitat restoration. Yet Chuck Howard has yet to receive a call, wondering when his expertise might be utilized.

(C.) The levees technical team is now being headed by Victor. They will be starting up soon. We can always use some help. Dave Gore is on our impact analysis team. He can join in on that group. Corps would disagree that we should abandon in channel islands.

(Q.) Before figuring out which island to restore, protect, we need to analyze the geomorphic reality since it may point to other islands as candidates.

(C.) In channel islands are a work in progress. We see a little bit of a chance of putting in some good habitat.

(Q.) We just don't want to put in habitat to have it washed out.

(Q.) When you consider setback levees and the expensive Program, in channel islands maybe won't add up to much.

(Q.) #10: uniform funding and level of protection throughout the Delta. Not sure where this language came from, but it needs to be clarified. Part of it seems to be referring to the common program, which is supposed to bring all levees up to PL-99 standard. This is needed because the Corps will only go in after a flood and pump out an island if it was previously approved under PL-99 standards. Right now, only 2 islands have been pre-approved. The common program is supposed to bring levees up to PL-99. There's talk of a prioritization system to bring some levees up to even higher standards--reference to #11-- such as islands needed to protect water quality or habitat, since PL-99 isn't that great of a standard.

(C.) Sounds like much of what you're citing can be handled once Victor gets going. We know that nothing has happened for 6 months and more needs to be done on it.

(Victor) In terms of public documents, outside of the technical team materials, there is not a comprehensive description of the levee common program. My prime objective is to get that comprehensive description together and to put it into a program document.

(Q.) There are 3 things under the ERPP we feel very strongly about: (1) what kinds of tools will be used; (2) adaptive management--we support if you use our definition of adaptive management. We need to lay out what we mean by adaptive management and how we would implement it. Adaptive management has become too much of a buzzword; (3) the need for outside,

independent, scientific evaluation.

(C.) Could you clarify what **you** mean by adaptive management?

(Q.) Adaptive management means monitoring, seeing things and responding to triggers. Try this, does it work. What do you need to do to make it work. Don't stop doing things waiting for new info to come along.

(A.) The ERPP comes in 3 vols. The third volume should address the issue of adaptive management.

(Q.) There are 3 things I've heard squabbling over the most, mostly from the ESA folks, under common program. (1) There is concern about improving areas without knowing what existing sensitive species may be in that area, which feeds into the next point; (2.) There is general frustration over the level of detail--it's too general to evaluate effects upon endangered species, especially in relationship to new storage and conveyance facilities, setback levees, and flooding areas to provide new habitat. We need more info, and it doesn't seem to be coming. (3.) There is concern about comment on Page 6 about storing and using water to dilute pollutants.

Penultimate Paragraph on first page.

(C.) CALFED will meet existing demands.

(Q.) Lester said we're not looking at demands, period. We're not looking at the water needs of the state, now or any time, current or future demand.

(Ron) Our basic objective is to eliminate the bottlenecks. Future development will increase demand. We don't want to come back with CALFED #3 in 5 years.

(Q.) You really need to articulate that very clearly up front in the document.

(Q.) Just to put it on your radar. If the reason you pick those future demands is to evaluate the alternatives from the standpoint of how resilient is it going to be if we have to meet future increased demand. Is that okay without implicating the project as trying to meet those demands?

(A.) One of the most difficult things is how to meet our objectives for water supply reliability, and not yield.

(Q.) Realize that a lot of people who voted for Prop 204 read into it that it would address future state water needs.

(Q.) I want to return to the Trinity flows in the No-Action for a second. Is there a problem if there's a discrepancy between CVPIA's No Action and CALFED's?

(A.) We don't see CALFED as being on top of CVPIA. We can't rely only upon CVP owing to SWP power stuff. We have to consider a wider picture.

(Q.) It's important to do some sensitivity analyses.

Meeting adjourned